

REMARKS

In response to the current Office Action, original claims 1 to 15 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 16 to 29 which deal with the objections in paragraph 2 of the Office Action as well as the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The previous multiple claim dependencies have been eliminated in the new set of claims submitted herewith, and examination of all of the claims on their merits is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 4 as being indefinite under 35 U.S. C. 112, second paragraph. New independent claim 16 replaces claim 1, and the wording of this claim is revised to deal with the Examiner's rejections based on some of the original wording in claim 1. Specifically, the word "especially" has been canceled in claim 16 and in the corresponding portions of new independent claims 28 and 29, which replace previous claims 13 and 15. The phrase "its own fee database" has been changed to --the fee databases of the service provider and other service agencies involved--, eliminating the phrase "comparable facilities" which the Examiner regards as indefinite. The service agencies are defined as comprising service or content suppliers and telecommunication and transmission systems. These modifications are present in new independent claims 16, 28 and 29, and it is submitted that these changes deal with all of the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 17 replaces claim 2 and the wording of this claim excludes the parenthetical phrase which rendered original claim 2 indefinite. It is believed that this deals with the Examiner's rejection of claim 2.

As regards the use of the term "databases" and "fee databases" in claims 3 and 4, claims 1 and 18, which include the subject matter of claims 3 and 4, respectively, and all other claims use the term "fee databases" consistently, which has proper antecedent basis in claim 16 which defines multiple fee databases, specifically the fee databases of the service provider and other service agencies.

In preparing the new set of claims, all of the original claims, including those not considered on their merits by the Examiner, were reviewed for other potential indefinite language and any such language was revised as necessary. It is believed that new claims 16 to

29 deal with all of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that these claims are all clear in scope. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections in paragraph 4 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 to 4 as obvious in view of the Jagadish and Saari patents. It is submitted that the new claims submitted herewith are all fully distinguished from these references. New claim 16 combines the subject matter of original claims 1 and 3. The combined teachings of Jagadish and Saari fail to disclose a method for notifying a user's transmission and service cost for using telecommunication systems in which the costs for services of service and content suppliers, such as costs for a file download, are determined and transmitted to the user's terminal, in addition to the communication connection costs of the service provider. Although Jagadish mentions other types of communication devices in column 5, lines 45 to 48, this reference is still only concerned with communication connection charges, regardless of the type of communication device to which the call is made. There is no suggestion of determining or providing billing charges including charges which may be incurred for other data services, such as file downloads.

Although Saari describes a method of charging for use of a network connection, there is no motivation suggested in Saari or Jagadish for one skilled in the field to combine the teachings of these references, and such a combination would not result in the invention as claimed in this application. Neither reference suggests having a first service provider determine fee information from the fee databases of the provider as well as those of other service agencies involved, where the other service agencies comprise service and content suppliers and telecommunication and transmission systems. In this invention, not only the cost for the communication connection but also the costs for services of service and content suppliers, i.e. costs for a file download, are determined and transmitted to the user's terminal.

It is therefore submitted that claim 16 is fully distinguished from Jagadish and Saari. Claims 17 to 27 depend from claim 16 and are distinguished from the references for the same reasons as claim 16, and additionally since these claims define other features not described or suggested by the references.

Independent claims 28 and 29 are also distinguished from the cited references. Referring to claim 28, the references do not suggest any means for obtaining a forecast or estimate for a future cost-intensive service or transmission by determining the estimated service

and/or transmission costs involved in cooperation with the connected service agencies. Referring to claim 29, the references do not describe or suggest user initiated transmission of data from a remote Internet service provider to the service provider and later transmission of the data from the service provider to the user's terminal.

It is submitted that the invention as defined in claims 16 to 29 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration and reversal of the rejection in paragraph 7 is respectfully requested.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment and argument deals with all outstanding grounds of objection and rejection and that claims 16 to 29, all claims remaining in this application following the amendment, are now in order for allowance. If there are any remaining grounds of objection or rejection which could be dealt with by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 7, 2006

By: Katherine Proctor  
Katherine Proctor  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 23,088

GORDON & REES LLP  
101 West Broadway, Suite 1600,  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 696-6700  
Facsimile: (619) 696-7124

Docket No. BIPRI 1022084